Appln. S.N. 09/997,761 Amdt. dated May 12, 2008 Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2008 Docket No. GP-301187-OST-ALS Page 5 of 6

REMARKS

The Office Action of January 10, 2008 has been received and carefully reviewed. It is submitted that, by this Amendment, all bases of rejection are traversed and overcome. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-33 have been cancelled herein. New claims 34-46 have been added herein. Support for these new claims may be found throughout the specification as filed, at least at page 18, line 17 through page 30, line 22, and in Figures 5-14. Consideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-25 and 27-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chou et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,330,499). Claims 7, 17 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou in view of Doi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2001/10014911).

The Applicant has cancelled claims 1-33, and thus submits that the rejections are rendered moot.

Regarding new claims 34-46, the Applicant submits that such claims are neither taught nor suggested by Chou or Doi, either alone or in combination. Neither reference teaches defining a plurality of user profiles, wherein each profile is contained in one member of a set of unique objects and is associated with a service in the plurality of services; retrieving an object containing a profile associated with the user and with the requested service; including the retrieved object in a second service request to a service provider; and receiving a response to the second service request from the service provider, the response being tailored to the user based upon the profile contained in the retrieved object.

For all the reasons stated above, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as defined in independent claims 34 and 40, and in those claims depending ultimately therefrom, is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious by Chou and Doi, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Appln. S.N. 09/997,761 Amdt. dated May 12, 2008 Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2008 Docket No. GP-301187-OST-ALS Page 6 of 6

In summary, claims 1-33 have been cancelled herein and new claims 34-46 remain in the application. It is submitted that, through this Amendment, Applicant's invention as set forth in these claims is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Further and favorable consideration is requested. If the Examiner believes it would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's Attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

DIERKER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

/Julia Church Dierker/

Julia Church Dierker Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 33368 (248) 649-9900, ext. 25 juliad@troypatent.com

3331 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 109 Troy, Michigan 48084-2813 Dated: May 12, 2008 JCD/JRK/jo